

*Supply*

**Mr. Orlikow:** Next election she'll be gone.

**Mr. McCurdy:** I would not accuse the Minister of State for Youth (Mrs. Champagne) of lying because it may be untrue and it certainly would be unparliamentary. I would not accuse the Minister of State for Youth of misleading the House because while it may be true, it certainly is unparliamentary. However, when the Minister of State alleges—

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** I should tell the Hon. Member that he is walking on slippery ground right now. It may not be unparliamentary, but I would ask him to proceed.

**Mr. McCurdy:** Having reached the shores of that little excursion into rhetoric, let me point out the subject of it. The Minister of State said that there was a meeting of young people over the weekend in the City of Ottawa. Let me point out that that meeting was held because the Government failed to hold the forum it had promised those young people it would hold. Of course, the Minister of State could not have known that I was there because they refused to invite her. She could not see that I was in fact there.

If the Minister had been listening to debate rather than reading what her assistants had written for her, she would also know that we have not been so silly as to criticize young people for taking private-enterprise jobs.

**Mrs. Champagne:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Very inadvertently, the Hon. Member for Windsor—Walkerville (Mr. McCurdy) has misled the House by saying that I could not have known whether he was there or not because I was not invited nor were members of my staff. I did meet with the young people so he is misleading the House, Sir.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** I think that is a matter of debate. I do not think that the Minister meant that the Hon. Member was deliberately misleading the House. I think it is a matter of debate.

**Mr. McCurdy:** No, Mr. Speaker, it's true. They met with the Minister of State for Youth after the meeting that she did not attend.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** I will allow the Hon. Member for Windsor—Walkerville to complete his comments.

**Mr. McCurdy:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask just a couple of questions.

**Mrs. Champagne:** Well, ask them.

**Mr. McCurdy:** In evaluating the private-enterprise career-oriented summer jobs as opposed to those in the non-profit area, would it be appropriate to ask if those jobs would have existed whether or not they were funded by Challenge '86? So much of what the Minister says flies in the face of her own report. She says that career-oriented jobs in the private sector are better than those in the non-profit sector, but she has her own report that was prepared for her, just like her speech was.

She ought to know that there are more new jobs created in the non-profit sector than in the private-enterprise sector and that those jobs are satisfying and more useful.

• (1650)

My God, when government Members enter into debate, let them participate on their own and not be limited to what others tell them to say and thus fail to address the question.

[Translation]

**Mrs. Champagne:** Mr. Speaker, the evaluation referred to by the Hon. Member had to do of course with the 1985 program. As in any self-respecting department, once the program has been in place for a few months we try to assess its strong points and its weaker aspects. That is a matter of course. It is something we did in order indeed to improve the Challenge 86 program, and we are quite proud of the changes made. Besides, I think that change we made precisely to make sure the jobs allotted to the private sector would not have been otherwise created and this is something we have done. We have also asked employers to sign a form in that case.

Something else has helped a lot. Last year, when applications came in, jobs were provided only on a first come, first served basis. But such has not been the case in 1986, because a deadline was set. We could then match possible employers with possible employees. And each Hon. Member, including the Hon. Member for Windsor—Walkerville (Mr. McCurdy), could decide, make recommendations and discuss with the people at the Employment and Immigration office the projects that would be accepted or not. And the Hon. Member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine East (Mr. Allmand) said so himself earlier. He also has done that.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The Hon. Member for Montreal—Sainte-Marie (Mr. Malépart) for a question or comment.

**Mr. Malépart:** Mr. Speaker, I have a very brief comment, because I will be speaking later and the Minister will be there. I have three questions to test the Minister's intellectual honesty.

First, is it a fact that in each and every constituency in the Montreal area, 40 per cent of the moneys were reserved for the private sector? I would like the Minister to produce the written instructions sent to those people.

Second, can the Minister tell us why, in my constituency, a company such as Aqua Parc got, without my permission, an extra \$22,000, this money being given to a private sector operator who would have created the jobs anyway, and in turn an FTQ project was turned down?

**Mrs. Champagne:** Mr. Speaker, in reply to the Hon. Member's first question, I have never seen any written instructions or other form of percentage rule being given to anyone.

We received 27 per cent more applications from the private sector to create the greatest possible number of jobs. Yes, we